SOME NOTES FROM

WESTERN SOURCES ON GALDAN

Davor Antonucci

(Univ. "La Sapienza", Facoltà di Studi Orientali, Roma)

The seventeenth century represents a crucial turning point in the history of Central Asia. Three empires – Russian, Chinese and Zhüngar (*i.e*. Western Mongols) – struggled for supremacy in the eastern part of the Eurasian continent. The Russian Empire began its expansion eastward across Siberia in the second half of the sixteenth century. The Russian pioneers subdued many Central Asian and Mongol tribes during their advance eastward. By the middle of the seventeenth century they had already reached the Amur River, threatening the Chinese's control over the Amur Basin.[1] In 1644 the Manchus conquered Peking and established the new Qing dynasty (1644-1911). Nevertheless, they spent the following four decades driving out the loyalists of the Ming dynasty from the southern regions. Emperor Kangxi (r. 1662-1722) could not turn his full attention to the northern frontiers until the suppression of the Three Feudatories Uprising in 1681. Besides the Russian threat to the northeastern frontiers, relationships with the Mongol tribes had strategic importance to the dynasty's frontier policy.[2] Although the Inner Mongols had been subdued since 1636, Qalqa Mongols in the north and the Western Mongols in the northwestern regions were not pacified yet.[3]

[1] Mancall, 1971, pp. 20-32.

[2] Barfield, 1989, pp. 275-277.

[3] According to Pelliot (1960, pp. 8; 19) who quoted the *Zhungeer quan bu jilüe* by Emperor Qianlong (1763) and the *Qinding wai fan Menggu Hui bu wang gong biaozhuan* (1779-1795), the "Dorbed Oirad", or "Four Oirad", were the Qoshud, the Dörbed, the Torghud and the Čoros/Zhüngar. On the origin of the "Four Oirad"; see also Okada, 1987.

The Zhüngar tribe, under Bātur Qong-taiji (r. 1634-1653) increased its power among the other Western Mongol tribes. Under Galdan (Galdan Boshogtu Qan, 1644-r. 1678-1697),[4] Batur's seventh son, the Zhüngar built a powerful state establishing their control over west Mongolia, vast part of present-day Xinjiang and Qinghai (Köke-nūr). Moreover, the growing power of the Zhüngar was a serious threat to the weak and quarrelling Qalqa. As a matter of fact, a quarrel between two Qalqa Qans led both Galdan and Kangxi to intervene in Northern Mongolia.[5] With the Treaty of Nerchinsk in 1689, disputes between the Russian Empire and the Qing dynasty about the borders were peacefully resolved.[6] One of Kangxi's major reasons for negotiating was his wish to avoid the Russians supporting Galdan.[7]

The Sino-Zhüngar conflict in the last decade of the seventeenth century was of great importance to the strengthening and development of the Qing Empire; as a matter of fact, Kangxi's campaigns against Galdan not only helped to establish Manchu control over Northern Mongolia but also the temporary subordination of Tibet, Köke-nūr and Turkestan oasis. Actually, Galdan's invasion of Northern Mongolia in 1688 led the Qalqa to ask for Kangxi's protection. As a result in 1691, Qalqa Qans convened at the meeting of Dolōn-nūr to swear allegiance to the Qing Emperor. The conflict between Kangxi and Galdan lasted from 1690 to 1697. During this time Kangxi launched four personal expeditions beyond the Great Wall against his Zhüngar enemy. He never succeeded in fighting against Galdan, who was eventually defeated by General Fiyanggū at Jao-modo in 1696. However, as in the previous battles the Zhüngar Qan managed to escape. Finally, Galdan abandoned by his own generals died under mysterious circumstances in 1697.

Great attention has been paid by both sinologists and mongolists to the encounter between these two great figures of the seventeenth century. The bulk of the studies on this war are mainly based on Chinese sources: notably these are the *Da Qing lichao shilu* 大清歷朝實錄 [Historical records of the Qing dynasty] and the *Qinzheng pingding Shuomo fanglüe* 親征平定朔漠方略 [Outline History of the Personal Expeditions to Pacify the Northwest Frontiers]. The latter was commissioned by Kangxi himself at the end of the war: three Great Secretaries were appointed to carry out this task.[8] It was completed in 1708, in Chinese, Manchu and Mongolian versions. The *fanglüe*

[4] Atwood, 2004, pp. 193-194.

[5] Perdue, 2005, p. 144.

[6] On the Treaty of Nerchinsk see J. Sebes, S.J., 1961.

[7] Perdue, 2005, p. 166.

[8] Hummel, 1943-44, I, p. 66; Perdue 2004, p. 74.

was a new and widespread Qing genre dealing with the history of Qing official military campaigns.[9]

Are there any other sources at our disposal? Since the Jesuits entered the Middle Kingdom at the end of the sixteenth century they began to be interested in Chinese history. Thus, they not only compiled works like Martino Martini's *Decas Primae*, a comprehensive history of ancient China based on Chinese sources, but at the same time they were also eye-witnesses of important historical events that they recorded for the benefit of the Mission. Such work as Martini's *De Bello Tatarico Historia* (1654), is a prime example. As far as the war between Kangxi and Galdan is concerned, we have two interesting texts at our disposal written by the Jesuits attached to the suite of the Kangxi Emperor during his military campaigns: namely Jean-François Gerbillon and Antoine Thomas.[10] The former is the author of the well known series of diaries about his trips in Tartary published in 1735, by Du Halde (1674-1743) in the fourth volume of his *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie Chinoise*;[11] the latter wrote a concise history of this war entitled "*De Bello Cam Hi Imperatoris Tartaro:Sinici contra Tartaros Erutanos. Feliciter confecto anno 1697*", a manuscript still unpublished.[12] Nevertheless, scholars often overlook the importance of these Western accounts made by eye-witnesses of the events recorded. Of course, these sources cannot be compared in richness and wideness of information with the monumental chronicles of Qing era, however, in my opinion, they represent important and valuable primary sources that can make a great contribution to the study of Chinese history.

First of all, these sources give us a point of view on historical facts, that of the Jesuit's, which is often different from the biased Chinese official history which is written in barren and bureaucratic style. Secondly, through these accounts we gather information on the Jesuits' activities in China, their involvement in important historical events, such as the Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689) and their own opinions about these events. Finally, as Ahmad writes: "Gerbillon's writings have to be treated as a first-hand source, because he was next to the Manchu Court and was either an eye-witness to many of the

[9] Perdue, 2005, pp. 464-65.

[10] Father Thomas Pereira also joined the third campaign in 1696.

[11] "Tartary" and "Tartars" are the traditional terms used in the Western world since de Middle Ages to indicate all the people living in the Central Eurasian continent (see below "Tartary rediscovered").

[12] The whole transcription and a complete annotated Italian translation from Latin can be found in the author's Ph. D. dissertation. An English annotated translation is forthcoming. Hereafter *DBE*.

events he recorded, or gather his information from eye-witnesses or other people who, although were not eye-witnesses, were likely to have heard reliable accounts".[13] The same remarks can be made, of course, about Thomas's manuscript.

In this paper I will give a short description of Galdan's life and career from the point of view of the two Jesuits who accompanied Kangxi during his campaigns outside the Great Wall.[14] Since the Jesuits were attached to the suite of the Emperor, they mainly pay attention to the events dealing with Kangxi's personal expeditions. On the other hand, I will focus on Galdan's nature as perceived by the two Jesuits. He not only was considered as a serious threat to the peace and security of the Empire by the Qing, but at the same time was also a follower of the Dalai Lama, then a menace to the spread of Christianity in China in the Jesuits' eyes. In particular, Chinese historians have always depicted Galdan as a crafty and dishonest man. Most of this judgement is also shared, as we shall see, by the Jesuits, who opposed Galdan's dishonesty and evil in contrast to the Emperor's benevolence and love for peace. Finally it should be remembered that during their trips into Tartary, Thomas and Gerbillon also made several scientific and geographical observations. Some short notes on their knowledge of Tartary are also given.

Antoine Thomas and Jean-François Gerbillon: two Jesuits in the Emperor's retinue

Since Verbiest's time, Kangxi was accustomed to being accompanied during his trips outside the Great Wall by the Jesuit Fathers; Verbiest's efforts during these trips are well known.[15] Even during his campaigns against the Zhüngar leader Kangxi wanted the Jesuit Fathers, particularly Gerbillon and Thomas, to go with him *ad res solatium et res literarias* across the Gobi desert into the Tartary grasslands. To begin with, I will provide some short notes on these two Jesuits and on their accounts about the military campaigns they joined. Since the life and works of Father Gerbillon are widely known, I will focus my attention on Father Thomas and his little known manuscript. Since in the latter many chapters deal with the Zhüngar Qan it is easier to find much more information about Galdan's nature in it than in Gerbillon's diaries. Naturally, the Kangxi Emperor is the leading protagonist in Thomas's manuscript as well as in Gerbillon's.

Antoine Thomas was born in Namur, Belgium, on January 25, 1644. He began asking to be sent as missionary in the Far East when he was 19 years

[13] Ahmad, 1970, p. 55.

[14] The orthograph of the French quotations follows exactly the original text.

[15] Verbiest's trips into Tartary are to be found in *Description*, pp. 74-86.

old.[16] In 1677, at 33 years old, he was finally assigned to the China Mission by Father General P. Oliva (1600-1681), but he didn't reach Beijing until eight years later in November, 1685. He never left China where he spent all of his life until July 28, 1709. By the time Thomas arrived in Beijing, he had already accomplished his theological studies and was a fine scientist well-versed in astronomy and mathematics. He very quickly became a secretary for Verbiest (1623-1688), the head of the China Mission, helping him with astronomical observations. After Verbiest's death in 1688 Thomas together with Father Pereira headed *ad interim* the Directorate of Astronomy until 1694. Moreover, Thomas was involved in teaching arithmetic, algebra, trigonometry and logarithms to the Emperor, while Gerbillon and Bouvet taught him geometry.[17] Thomas made several trips for the Emperor drawing maps of the Empire. Nevertheless, his activity as a cartographer is linked to the Jesuit's attempt to establish an overland route to China. It is noteworthy since the first letters after his arrival, Thomas shows interest towards Tartary and its environment.[18] As well known, Thomas could draw new maps of Central Asia thanks to some new information gathered by Gerbillon and Pereira during their journeys across Tartary as members of the Chinese delegation in the peace negotiations with Russia in 1688 and 1689.[19]

The Sino-Zhüngar conflict gave Thomas the chance to reach Tartary in 1696 and 1697 as a member of the Kangxi retinue.[20] As mentioned earlier, Thomas wrote an account of the campaigns he witnessed along with Gerbillon, which has been almost unknown up until now. Upon reading carefully, it is clear that the manuscript is not only an account of the Emperor's campaigns that he joined, but also a detailed and concise history of the war between Kangxi and Galdan from the very beginning to its end. It should be noted that Thomas's account was written only a short time after his return and that is very close to those events that he participated in. This makes the account extremely

[16] See Mme Yves de Thomaz de Bossière, 1977, pp. 4-5.

[17] Jami, 2007, p. 453.

[18] *Annotationes Mensis Septembris Anni 1686,* Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI), jap. sin. 150, f. 136v.

[19] These maps are the *Duplex iter terrestre in Chinam ex Persia et ex Mogor iuxta descriptionem a P. Antonii Thomae missam 1690 ex Sina*; *Tartaris Imago*, jap. sin. 105, f. 5, f. 7; and the *Tabula geographica Orientis iuxta autographum P. Antonii Thomae Belgae e Societate Iesu missum Pekino anno 1690*; *Tabula geographica Orientis*, jap. sin. 110, preserved in the ARSI. For the new Thomas's maps found in the Archivio di Stato in Rome see Lo Sardo, 2003. As far as the Treaty of Nerchinsk is concerned Pereira's diary has been published by Sebes, 1961; Gerbillon's accounts of 1688 and 1689 trips are in *Description*, pp. 88-162 and 163-251 respectively.

[20] He reached Tartary again along with Gerbillon in 1698.

valuable as primary source. Let me briefly introduce this interesting manuscript.[21]

The text consisting of 29 folios r/v and is divided into ninety-two chapters and one hundred twenty-one sub-sections. The text is an original autograph of Thomas written in fine and easily-legible handwriting. In the first chapter of his story Thomas explains the causes, which led to the war. Since he wanted the readers to be acquainted with the topic he was going to deal with, he starts his work with a geographical description of Tartary and its past history up to its present situation. The first Emperor's expedition of 1690, in which he did not take part, covers only two chapters. He also briefly refers to the assembly of Dolōn-nūr. The core of the manuscript (43 chapters) discusses the second Emperor's campaign in 1696 in which Thomas, along with Gerbillon and Pereira took part. These chapters are mainly based on Thomas's personal observations. The story follows the army advancing across the Gobi desert up to the Kerulen river. Then, the Emperor due to a lack of food supplies decided to go back; while fleeing from the Emperor's army, Galdan ran into the West Army led by General Fiyanggū (ch. Feiyanggu 費楊古, 1645-1701). In the battle of Jao-modo (now Züünmod, near Ulaanbaatar) on June 12, the Zhüngar Qan was defeated by the Qing army but manage to escape. Even if he did not witness the decisive battle, Thomas's account of it is detailed and vivid. The Emperor's last campaign – from February to July 1697 – which he joined, is also widely described by Thomas (30 chapters in all). Actually, Galdan had died under mysterious circumstances during the spring of 1697. Nevertheless, Thomas's account does not end with Galdan's death but continues with the surrender of Galdan's lieutenants until the end of November, when the high lama adviser to Galdan was put to death by slicing.

Thomas wrote a first draft of the text at the end of the Emperor's campaign in 1696 and concluded it with his last campaign in 1697. Whether he updated the previous text of 1696, or just added the new chapters remains unsolved.[22] As a matter of fact, he considered this event worthy of narrating because of its importance to the Chinese Empire and to Christianity's destiny in China. Some more information can be also found in Thomas's correspondence that is widely used in this paper as well.[23]

Jean-François Gerbillon was born in Verdun, on June 11, 1654.[24] In 1685 he was chosen as one of the "mathématiciens du Roy", a group of six Jesuits

[21] For an introduction to the manuscript see also Antonucci, 2007b, *passim.*

[22] Antonucci, 2007b, p. 24.

[23] Most of Thomas's correspondence is preserved in ARSI.

[24] See Thomaz de Bossière, 1994.

sent by Louis XIV to China.[25] They set sail for China in 1685; after a stop in Siam they eventually arrived at the Chinese port of Ninbo (Zhejiang). From here, thanks to Verbiest's meeting with the Emperor, they were given permission to reach Beijing where they arrived just a few days after Verbiest's death. The French Fathers' arrival faced hostility from the Portuguese Fathers who desired to send the newcomers into the provinces.[26] Finally Kangxi decided to keep Bouvet and Gerbillon, sending the others to the provinces. Like Thomas, Gerbillon and Bouvet were also involved in teaching the Emperor.

Thanks to his superior qualities Gerbillon was chosen in 1688, along with Pereira, as a member of the Chinese delegation for the peace negotiations with Russia to be held in Selenginsk. This was his first trip to Tartary, but because of Galdan's invasion of Qalqa dominions the delegation was forced to turn back to Beijing. The next year the two Jesuits gave their contribution to the famous Treaty of Nerchinsk.[27] From 1688 to 1698 Gerbillon made eight trips into Tartary; his detailed diaries kept during these trips were published by Du Halde in 1735 in his monumental compendium of China that is the *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie Chinoise*. From a historical point of view, Gerbillon's participation in many important Chinese historical events, such as the Treaty of Nerchinsk, the assembly of Dolōn-nūr in 1691 and the main Kangxi campaigns against Galdan make his writings one of the main contributions made by a European to the knowledge of both Chinese and Mongolian history of the time. Moreover, Gerbillon's diaries represent an extremely valuable source of information about Tartary and its population. As a matter of fact, during each one of his trips the Jesuit was used to making geographical and astronomical observations, which proved his scientific skills. It is noteworthy that he always reported toponyms of the places he stopped in or passed through.

Particularly, I will concentrate upon his *Observation historiques sur la grande Tartarie*,[28] and on his diaries kept during his three trips, namely those of 1696, 1696-97 and 1697, during the conflict against the Zhüngar when he

[25] These Jesuits were: Jean de Fontaney (1643-1710), Joachim Bouvet (1656-1730), Claude de Visdelou (1656-1737), Jean-François Gerbillon (1654-1707), Louis Le Comte (1665-1728), Guy Tachard (1648-1712) ; the latter never reached China and remained in Siam. Pfister, 1932-1934.

[26] Jami, 1994, p. 535.

[27] Sebes, 1961.

[28] See *Observation historiques sur la grande Tartarie, tirées des Mémoires du Père Gerbillon*, in Du Halde, 1735, vol. IV, pp. 33-59.

was a member of Kangxi's retinue.[29] The former is both a brief introduction to the geography of Tartary and a concise historical account of Tartary and the Sino-Zhüngar war. The Jesuits' scientific skills were most probably one of the main reasons that the Emperor brought them with him. On many occasions Gerbillon reports to have made scientific measurements with the Emperor. Moreover, during the fourth campaign (1697) thanks to Thomas's calculations an eclipse was predicted. It is noteworthy since thanks to these calculations, Kangxi was able to ease the people's fear by announcing it three days in advance.

Before discussing the information that the two Jesuits recorded about Galdan, it should be taken into account that neither Thomas nor Gerbillon ever personally met the Zhüngar Qan. As a matter of fact, they joined Kangxi's expeditions against Galdan but the Emperor never succeeded in fighting the enemy on the battlefield, nor managed to capture him. At the time of Galdan's death almost nobody had the chance to see him personally. Nevertheless, Jesuits' intimacy with the Emperor and the Court entourage enabled them to gather first-hand information from eye-witnesses, as in the case of the battle of Jao-modo. Thus, all the information gathered, either through personal observations or from eyewitnesses, was fixed once and for all in their writings. As Peter Perdue pointed out, Chinese compilations were not unbiased collections; although the *Shuomo fanlüe* still retains contradictory details, these were removed in later retellings.[30] As far as the Jesuit's writings are concerned, the history was not rewritten, remaining unchanged until now; however, these works are not neutral. The Kangxi Emperor was seen as a wise and capable ruler, a model of *benevolentia* (see the Edict of Tolerance towards Christianity of 1692). In order to praise Kangxi's *benevolentia* and *pietas*, the Jesuits contrasted him with the craftiness and evil of his enemy: Galdan; a man dominated by his hunger for power and his desire for revenge. Hence, from the Chinese official historian's point of view Galdan was the man "who failed to understand the will of Heaven";[31] and in the same way Thomas believed that he was not in favour with God.[32]

[29] Gerbillon's fifth, sixth and seventh trips are to be found in Du Halde, pp. 304-335; 336-355; and 356-384 respectively.

[30] Perdue, 2005, p. 465.

[31] Perdue, 2004, p. 76.

[32] *DBE*, ch. 61. It is noticing that in the *Relatio descripta a P. Antonius Thomas eorum quae observavit in Tartaria* Thomas writes: "*…hac felicitate temporali Deo, ut opinor, Imperatorem pro data libertate divinae Legis praemiante*" ARSI, jap. sin. 149, f. 558v.

Tartary rediscovered

What did the Jesuits know about Tartary? At the very beginning of their works both Thomas and Gerbillon provide the readers with a geographical description of Tartary as well as of the division among Mongol tribes. Some short notes on Mongols' past history are also given. This information demonstrates the broad knowledge acquired by the two Jesuits, since their arrival, on the ecology and people of Central Asia.[33] Regarding the geography of Tartary in the *Observation historiques sur la grande Tartarie* Gerbillon writes:

> *Je comprend ici sous le nom de la grande Tartarie toute cette partie de notre continent, laquelle se trouve entre la mer Orientale qui est au Nord du Japon, la Mer Glaciale, la Moscovie, la Mer Caspienne, la Perse, le Mogol, le Royaume d'Arracan proche de Bengale, celui d'Ava, l'Empire de la Chine, & le Royaume de Corée: de sorte que la grande Tartarie est bornée à l'Occident par la Moscovie, la Mer Caspienne, & un coin de la Perse; au Sud par le même coin de la Perse, le Mongol, le Royaume d'Arracan & Ava, la Chine, & la Corée: à l'Orient par la mer Orientale, & au Nord par la Mer Glaciale.*[34]

Hence, "la grande Tartarie" roughly corresponds in Gerbillon's opinion to the Central Eurasian continent. A shorter but quite similar passage can be found in the second chapter of Thomas's *DBE*. This broad area is divided into "diverses Nations qui occupent chacune leur pays, & qui ont leurs coutumes, leur langue, & leur Religion différentes"(*Description*, p. 35). The first of these nations is inhabited by the Manchus, or Eastern Tartars (*Tartares Orientaux*), founders of the Qing dynasty. The second one corresponds to the lands inhabited by the Mongols, or Western Tartars (*Tartares Occidentaux*). On the Western Tartary Gerbillon writes:

> *Cette Nation comprend les* Kalmucs *ou* Eluths *les* Kalkas *& ceux qu'on appelle simplement* Mongous*, qui demeurent aux environs de la grande muraille. Leur Pays s'étend de l'Occident à l'Orient, depuis de la Mer Caspienne jusqu'aux Tartares Orientaux, dont nous venons de parler, c'est-à-dire, jusqu'à 2. ou 3. dégrez de longitude au-delà du Méridien de* Pekin*, & du Midi au Nord depuis la grande Muraille de la Chine, jusques vers le 50^e^ dégré de latitude.*[35]

---

[33] A brief overview of the Jesuits' knowledge on Tartary from their arrival in China up to the end of the sixteenth century is found in Antonucci, 2007a (forthcoming).

[34] *Description*, p. 33.

[35] *Ibid*., p. 38.

All this people share a common language as well as common religious beliefs. Particularly, the *Kalmucs* or *Eluths* "occupent le pays qui est entre la Mer Caspienne & la montagne d'*Altaï*, de l'Occident à l'Orient & du Septentrion au Midi, entre les Moscovites & les Tartares *Yusbeks*"(*Description*, p. 39). According to Gerbillon the *Kalmucs* or *Eluths* are divided into three tribes corresponding to the Torghud, Zhüngar and Qoshūd. The Zhüngar tribe to which Galdan belongs is referred as follows:

> *Les seconds* Eluths, *que les Moscovites appellent aussi* Kalmucs, *sont ceux qui habitent depuis cette chaîne de montagnes, dont je viens de parler, jusques à une autre chaîne de hautes montagnes, dont la plus considérable s'appelle* Altaï*: c'est de cette montagne que sortent plusieurs grandes rivieres, dont les principales sont l'*Oby *& l'*Irtis*. Le Roy des* Eluths *tenoit ordinairement sa Cour vers la source de cette derniere riviere: ces peuples étoient nombreux, puissant, & occupoient une vaste étenduë de pays depuis les terres des Moscovites, jusqu'au pays des Tartares* Yusbeks*: mais ils s'affoiblirent & se ruinerent eux-mêmes par leurs division & par leurs guerres intestines.*[36]

Finally the "Tartares Mahométans" live in the third nation between Persia, the Caspian Sea up to the lands of the *Eluths* and the oases of Turfan, Yarkand and Hami (*Description*, p. 53). Thomas's text is less accurate and detailed than Gerbillon's. The main difference is that according to Thomas western Tartary is divided only between *Kalmucos et Mongalos*: "among the formers the most distinguished is the king of the Erutarum [Zhüngar],[37] among the latters the king of the Halha [Qalqa] region" (*DBE*, ch. 4, f. 620r). In another chapter (ch. 9) Thomas adds that the Qalqa dominions at the present time are divided among three different kings *ex eadem stirpe et sanguinem*. On the other hand, his knowledge about the "Erutani" is rather hazy; Thomas doesn't make a distinction between the Qoshūd and the Zhüngar tribes: they both are part of the same "Erutana familia".

As shown briefly the two Jesuits had a vast knowledge of the geography and people living beyond the Great Wall.[38] Since the time of Verbiest, the Jesuits'

---

[36] *Ibid*., pp. 39-40.

[37] The origin of "Erutarum" is well known: from the Mongol *ölöd* > *ölön* is the Chinese *Elute*, from which *Eluth* is used by Gerbillon and *Erutanus* by Thomas, *Eleuth* is the form used by Amiot. See Pelliot, 1960, p. 6.

[38] It might be worthwhile to make a comparison with Martini's knowledge. The *De Bello Tartarico Historia* is as follows: "Tartaros autem voco gentem illam, quae ad partes Septentrionales sita est, ultra famosum murum Sinarum [...]. Ea veterem Tartariam, tum Orientalem hactenus Europaeis ignotam, tum Occidentalem incolit; ubi *Samahania*, *Tanyu*,

interest in establishing an overland route to China, urged them to gather as much information on Central Asia as possible. By the way, Gerbillon and Pereira, thanks to their participation to the Treaty of Nerchinsk, were able to travel deep into the grasslands of Tartary, thus obtaining new and updated information. As mentioned earlier, Thomas's maps of 1690 can be considered a result of such a trip.

Galdan's fate

At the very beginning of his text Thomas introduces the readers to the causes of the war (*Belli Eruthani causae*, ch. 1), clearly explaining his own point of view: on one hand, he considered this war very dangerous for Christianity in China. The victory of one of the Sect of Idolaters' followers, i.e. the Buddhists, might have meant the loss of all the achievements obtained by the Fathers at Court from Ricci onward. On the other hand, Galdan is seen as the main person responsible for the war and the destruction of his own tribe. The Latin text is as follows:

> *Bellum Sinensi Imperio grave et rei Christianæ periculosum, breviter scribere suscepi; quod Imperator Tartaro:Sinensis, cum Caldano Rege Erutharum gessit. Occasionem belli praebuit, tum Caldani dominandi cupiditas, qua Imperio Sinensi inhiare videbatur; tum etiam ardor ulciscendi doloris sui, quem ex morte fratris minoris natu conceperat qui ab Halhano Rege fuerat necatus.*[39]

Thus, Galdan was not only driven by his hunger for power and by his ambition, but also by the great pain caused by the death of his brother. The desire of revenge was an important part of his requests to Kangxi in the letters they exchanged. In the same way, Gerbillon seems to lay the blame of the conflict on the Zhüngar Qan's ambition.

> *Cependant leur dernier Roy nommé* Caldan Pojoctou han, *après avoir réüni sous sa domination tout ce qui restoit de ce grand peuple, a détruit de nos jours l'Empire des* Kalkas *qui étoit puissant*

Niuche, *Niulhan* & similia gentis Regna, à minore Tartaria & Regno Cascar nimirum ad mare usque Orientale supra Iaponiam". Martini, 1654, p. 1.

[39] "I have started to write a brief description of a war which was important for the Empire and very dangerous for the Christians; a war that the Sino-Tartar Emperor led against the king of the Eruthans, Caldano. The occasion to this war was caused on one hand by Caldan's hunger for power, as he gazed eagerly upon the Chinese Empire, on the other hand by his desire for revenge, because of the pain he had suffered from the death of his younger brother, who had been killed by the Kings of the Halhans", *DBE*, ch. 1.

> *en Tartarie, & a même osé déclarer la guerre à l'Empereur de la Chine. Il ne pensoit à rien moins qu'à la conquête de cet Empire.*[40]

Who was Caldanus, or Caldan? The two Jesuits do not seem to be well informed about his origin and youth. Nothing is said about his date of birth. Regarding his kinship, Gerbillon says that he was "troisiéme fils du *Patourou hum Taiki* & frere de *Senghé* de même lit" (*Description*, p. 41), while Thomas affirms that he was the second son of one of the Western Tartary Princes of the Erutans (ch. 6). It is clear to both Gerbillon and Thomas that he was Sengge's younger brother, while Sengge's murderers were only his half-brothers.

Traditionally younger sons of Mongolian noble families were often sent to monasteries to become Buddhist monks.[41] Galdan, who was recognized as the rebirth of the dBen-sa sPrul-sku, was sent to Lhasa in Tibet to study with the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama.[42] In the *DBE* (*Quae Religio Tartarorum*, ch. 5) is recorded: "In that place [Lhasa] there is a large cenoby where not only the sons of common people but also of the Tartar princes are educated about sacrilegious beliefs and become monks". Moreover, Thomas says that the enmity between Galdan and the future rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu started during this period "because of his [the Qutugtu] haugthy nature" (*DBE*, ch. 6).

Religion plays an important role for the two Jesuits. It should be noted that both Thomas and Gerbillon's opinions on Buddhist lamas are quite negative:

> *La plûpart de ces Prêtres sont fort ignorans [...]. On ajoûte que la plûpart des* Lamas *se plongent dans la débauche , sur-tout avec les femmes, dont ils abusent impunément. Néanmoins les Princes du pays se laissent gouverner par leurs conseils, ils écoutent leurs avis avec respect, & l'honneur qu'ils leur rendent, va jusqu'à leur céder la premiere place dans les assemblées de cérémonie.*[43]

In Thomas's text the Dalai Lama, who is referred to as the *Pseudo-Pontifex*, is criticized because of his ambition to impose his *pestilentiae cathedra* upon the Chinese Empire (*DBE*, ch. 8).[44] Both Thomas and Gerbillon seem to be

---

[40] *Description*, p. 40.

[41] Albanese, 1981, p. 12.

[42] Ahamad, 1970, 232.

[43] *Description*, p. 38.

[44] In a letter of 1704 (September 2nd) about the Dalai Lama Thomas says: "*Pseudo-Pontifex, sive vivum illud idolum, mulieres ad amare coepit, et indigna agere sua imaginaria deitate; demum vero pertaesus illic sedere, ad excipiendas adorationes, personà fictitiae divinitatis*

aware of the close ties between the Dalai Lama and Galdan, in fact the former "bestowed upon him the title of king,[45] and through secret relationships, supported as much as possible his goals of conquering and dominating the Chinese empire" (*DBE*, ch. 8).[46] In the same way, all the Buddhist high hierarchies are responsible for supporting Galdan's actions against the Qing. After the Fifth Dalai Lamas' death in 1682, the regent of Tibet (*sde-pa*, *diba* 第巴 in Chinese sources, *Tipa* in *DBE* and *Description*) still provided support to Galdan; Gerbillon records that the Emperor "sçavoit que le *Tipa* & les *Lamas* appuyoient secrettement le *Caldan*, & étoient en état de traverser son entreprise" (*Description*, p. 43). Not to mention that the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu[47] had taken the political power of his brother, the Tüshiyetü Qan, in his hands (*...cumque Rex frater eius parum valeret ingenio, politicam quoque gubernatione usurpavit*, *DBE*, ch.6; in the *Description* is recorded.: "C'est son frere le Lama qui gouverne, sans qu'il ose y trouver à redire", p. 268). Moreover, with his behaviour he played an important role in the beginning of the hostilities with Galdan. Hence, Galdan's Buddhist education in his youth is seen by the Jesuits as extremely negative: very likely the cause of his future thoughtless actions.

In 1671, Sengge was murdered by his half-brothers. At this very moment Galdan came to the fore. According to Gerbillon:

> *Lorsqu'il apprit ces nouvelles il demanda permission au grand* Lama *de Thibet son maître, de quitter l'habit & la profession de* Lama, *pour venger la mort de son frere* Senghé.
>
> *Cette permission lui fut accordée: & aussitôt il forma un corps d'armée des anciens domestiques de* Senghé *& des troupes que lui accorda* Otchirtou, *& avec ce secours il se saisit des meurtriers de son frere; après les avoir fait mourir, il se rendit maître de tous les biens de ses freres & des Etats de* Senghé.[48]

---

abiectà, nomen regis et Regni regimen, una cum uxoribus assumpsit", ARSI, jap. sin. 149, f. 353v.

[45] In 1678 the Fifth Dalai Lama bestowed on Galdan the title of *bsTan-'dzin Bo-shog-thu Qan* (Qan of Divine Grace), Ahamd, 1970, p. 335; Albanese, 1981, p. 18.

[46] In a letter dated August 28, 1696, Thomas writes again: "*In Regno tibetano supremum suum Antistitem habent, qui summa est apud Tartaros Principes in autoritate: inventae sunt eius litterae in tentoria Caldani Regis, quibus eum ad bellum contra Imperatorem incitabat*", ARSI, jap. sin. 148, f. 210r.

[47] On the first rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu (mong.: Zhebsundamba Qutugtu): Atwood, 2004, pp. 267-268.

[48] *Description*, p. 41.

In Thomas's words Galdan's revenge is described in a dramatic and bloodthirsty tone: "furious because of the fratricide, he attacked and slaughtered [the murderer], then he threw the monk's habit away, thus being dominated by his ambition [...] he occupied his father's territories, and as a young boy of great ardour, spread terror among the neighbouring [countries]" (*DBE*, ch. 7).

Shortly after Galdan had defeated his former Qoshūd allies (1678), the Dalai Lama bestowed upon him the title of *Bo-shog-thu Qan*. Gerbillon seems to point out this special bond one more time: "Le Gand *Lama* récompensa ses cruautez & la perfidie dont il avoit usé envers un Roy son beau-pere & son bienfaicteur, en lui donnant le nom de *Han*, qui signifie Roy ou Empereur", (*Description*, p. 41). In a short time, thanks to his "aggressive nature",[49] he conquered a large part of his neighbouring countries "partly by force of arms, partly by craftiness, partly just by striking terror" (*DBE*, ch. 7). Among these countries Thomas mentions the oasis of "Turkestan" (which are "Yarkan", "Cascar", "Turfan", "Hami" and "Camul"), and other Muslim people living in the southern part of Tartary (*DBE*, ch. 7).

A quarrel over fugitives between two Qalqa Qans, the Tüshiyetü Qan and the Zhasagtu Qan led both Galdan and Kangxi to intervene in Northern Mongolia. Galdan backed the Zhasagtu Qan against the Tüshiyetü Qan, who was supported by his brother, the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu, the religious authority of Qalqa Mongols, and his old fellow disciple in Lhasa. Despite the fact that the two Qalqa Qans seemed to resolve their dispute at the Küriyen Belchiger peace conference called by Kangxi in 1686, Galdan complained about rJe-btun-dam-pa Qutugtu's behaviour, considering it disrespectful of the Dalai Lama's envoy.[50] Galdan's complaint was only recorded by Gerbillon. The Jesuit states that he gathered all the information about the conference from the Emperor's envoy Arani, President of the *Lifanyuan* (理藩院).[51] According to both Thomas and Gerbillon since the commitments made by the Tüshiyetü Qan and the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu were not fulfilled, the Zhasagtu Qan sought Galdan's assistance. As a response to Galdan's intervention, "Le *Lama Kalka* ne put retenir sa colere, il chargea de fers l'Ambassadeur, & renvoya quelques-uns de ses gens au Roy des *Eluths*

[49] In the *Shuomo fanlüe* a similar opinion on Galdan's nature was recorded; he was: "rough and crafty and likes fighting", quoted in Perdue, 2005, p. 139.

[50] Cf. Ahmad, 1970, pp. 267-268.

[51] *Description* (p. 48): "*L'envoyé de l'Empereur étoit le premier Président du Tribunal des* Mongous, *qui est à peu près du même Ordre que les six suprêmes Tribunaux de* Peking. *Cet Envoyé s'appelloit Argni: j'ai appris de lui-même, & de plusieurs autre Mandarins qui l'accompagnerent dans le voyage, les particularitez de cette négociation*".

avec des Lettres injurieuses, & menaçantes" (*Description*, p. 48). Thomas only reports that the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu (referred to as the *Tustuanus Pseudo-Antistites*), "who was the real ruler, was outraged against Galdan's intervention and haughtily expelled the envoys with heavy threats" (*DBE*, ch. 10).

Shortly after, in 1687, the Tüshiyetü Qan invaded the Zhasagtu Qan's territory and killed him. Dorji Jab, Galdan's younger brother, who has been sent by Galdan to aid the Zhasagtu Qan, was taken prisoner and murdered. In the *DBE* (ch. 10) the death of Galdan's younger brother is recorded as follows: " [The Tüshiyetü Qan] took his younger brother prisoner, after decapitating him, he stuck his head in a stake as a trophy and put it in the middle of the field".[52] Out of revenge for the murder of his brother, Galdan invaded the Qalqa territory, and crushed the Tüshiyetü Qan's forces:

> *Le Roy d'Eluth fit passer au fil de l'épée tout ce qui tomba sous sa main de Kalkas de la famille de Touchetou han, il pénétra jusqu'à son camp, & jusqu'au lieu où le Lama son frere avoit fixe sa demeure; il brûla tout ce qu'il ne put emporter, & ruina de fond en comble deux beaux Temples que le Lama avoit fait bâtir à grands frais. Ensuite il envoya battre la campagne par ses gens, & leur donna ordre de faire main basse, sur tout ce qui se trouveroit de Kalkas qui fuyoient de toutes parts.*[53]

As stated by Thomas in his first chapter, the desire for revenge for his brother's violent death was one of the main reasons, or merely a pretext, to attack the Qalqa. Moreover, his old enmity with the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu, and his disrespectful behaviour in the presence of the Dalai Lama's envoy led him to put the Qutugtu's dominions to fire and sword. As a consequence of Galdan's invasion, tens of thousands of fugitives fled north and south to seek protection. The Tüshiyetü Qan fled to China borders along with the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu. It is noteworthy that on their way to Selenginsk in 1688, Gerbillon and Pereira met a large number of Qalqa fugitives.[54] The exchange of letters between Galdan and Kangxi after the flight of the two Qalqa seems to be well known to Gerbillon (but not to Thomas), who stresses on Galdan's determination to avenge his brother's death and to punish the rJe-btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu's behaviour (*Description*, p. 50). In the end, the Emperor, having taken the Tüshiyetü Qan and the rJe-

[52] A quite similar description is found in *Description* (p. 49): "*…lui ayant fait trancher la tête, il la fit planter sur une pique, & l'exposa ainsi au milieu de la campagne*".

[53] *Description*, p. 49.

[54] *Description*, p. 49.

btsun-dam-pa Qutugtu under his protection, refused to hand the fugitives over to Galdan.[55]

In June 1690, Galdan invaded the Qalqa territories again; he quickly reached the Chinese border asking again for the surrender of the murderers. Kangxi decided to lead a personal expedition against the Zhüngar leader. Both Thomas and Gerbillon mention the battle of Utgui, where Arani didn't follow Kangxi's instructions not to fight until the main army had arrived, and during the night suddenly attacked Galdan, but was defeated. Regarding the sudden attack in the *DBE* (ch. 14) is was recorded: "The Erutans, well trained for war, rushed to arms, to ward off the force of the attackers; then engaged the enemy in battle and put the commander and his army to flight".[56] Then according to Thomas, while advancing quickly towards the Chinese border, Galdan ran into the Qing army and was defeated at Ulan-budung. Neither Thomas or Gerbillon witnessed this battle; we know that Gerbillon, and very likely Thomas, obtained his information from a report sent to court by the Emperor's brother (*Description*, p. 50); as a matter of fact, the two Jesuit versions are quite similar to each other (Thomas's is a little bit longer); both of them, for example, report that the Zhüngar used the camels as a wall lying behind them.[57] Galdan's bravery is recorded by Gerbillon as follows:

> *D'abord son avant-garde fut désolée par le canon ennemi, c'est ce qui l'obligea à changer de poste pour la mettre hors d'insulte: & comme il s'étoit placé derriere un grand marais, qui l'empêchoit d'être investi par l'armée de l'Empereur, il se défendit avec une bravoure incroyable jusqu'à la nuit, où chacun se retira dans son camp*.[58]

During the following negotiations Galdan fled to the north. While withdrawing, in front of an image of the Buddha, he swore an oath to the Emperor "qu'il ne reviendroit jamais sur les terres de l'Empereur, ni de ses

---

[55] Actually Kangxi was aware that Tüshiyetü Qan had violated the oath of peace attacking the Zhasagtu Qan. Cf. Ahmad, 1970, pp. 275-276; Perdue, 2005, p. 150.

[56] In the *Description*, (p. 51) the battle of Utgui is recorded as follows: "*Ces deux Présidens songérent à surprendre le Roi d'*Eluth *dans son camp, & ils y réüssirent, ils l'amuserent sous prétexte d'un traitté de paix, & lorsqu'il étoit moins que jamais sur la défiance, ils l'attaquerent pendant la nuit, mais ils furent repoussez avec vigueur, & poursuivis jusques sur les terres de l'Empire, où ils gagnerent les montagnes qui les mirent en sûreté*".

[57] "L'Armée d'*Eluth* s'étoit mis en bataille proche d'un ruisseau au pied d'une montagne, & s'étoit fait une espece de retranchement des ses chameaux; dans cette disposition, les *Eluths* attendirent nos gens, & accepterent la bataille", *Description* p. 237. See also Thomas, *Annotationes annuae*, 1694, ARSI, jap. sin. 149, f. 533r.

[58] *Description*, p. 51.

vassaux" (*Description*, p. 51, not recorded in *DBE*). During the retreat many Zhüngar died because of the lack of food supplies (*Description*, p. 51, *DBE*, ch. 16). Hence, Galdan went back to Zhüngaria in order to rebuild his force.

"In fact Caldanus, heavily weakened because of the defeat he had suffered one year before, stayed in his homeland; and although showing the desire of peace, he secretly planned to start the war again" (*DBE*, ch. 17). According to Thomas not only the Dalai Lama encouraged him to carry on with his plan, but also the high lama "Ilasu" (the Ilugsan Qutugtu) "continually encouraged him to seize [the Chinese] empire" (*DBE*, ch. 17).[59]

During the period between 1691 and 1696 Galdan tried to rebuild his strength, in the meanwhile his efforts to obtain both Qalqa and Russian support failed. It is worthwhile to take into consideration the letter sent by Galdan to the prince of Qorchin tribe, in which he tried to win over the Mongols appealing to their common religious beliefs:

> *N'est-il pas indigne, lui écrivoit-il, que nous devenions les Esclaves de ceux dont nous avons été les Maîtres; nous sommes* Mongous, *nous suivons une même Loy; nous devons donc unir nos forces pour reconquérir un Empire, qui est l'héritage des nos ancêtres & le nôtre: je veux bien partager la gloire & le fruit de mes conquêtes, avec ceux qui en auront partagé le péril; mais aussi s'il arrive, ce que je ne puis me persuader, que quelques-uns des Princes* Mongous *soient assez lâches pour vouloir être toûjours asservis aux* Mantcheoux *nos ennemis communs, qu'ils s'attendent à éprouver les premiers efforts de mes armes. Leur ruine entiere sera le prélude de la conquête de la Chine*.[60]

Regarding Russian aid Thomas says:

In truth, the Grand Dukes, in order to preserve the peace treaty signed not long ago with the Emperor, refused, with honour and honesty, to give help to him. Meanwhile, Caldanus boasted among the Western Tartars [i.e. the Qalqa] about the sixty thousand Russians sent to help him, who were about to arrive […].[61]

By 1695, partly because of poor harvests in his own homeland, and partly because he was lured by the Qorchin prince, Galdan crossed the Qalqa

[59] The Ilugsan Qutugtu was an envoy sent by Kangxi first to the Dalai Lama, then to Galdan. Once he arrived at Galdan's camp, he became one of Galdan's partisans , cf. Ahmad, 1970, p. 282. After the end of the war, he was murdered by slicing (see also *DBE*, ch. 91).

[60] *Description*, p. 52.

[61] *DBE*, ch. 20.

territories, advancing eastward again.[62] This time Emperor Kangxi had carefully prepared three large armies, gathering huge amounts of food and military supplies, in order to crush his enemy. It is not in the scope of this paper to cover all of the stages of the 1696 campaign; hence, I will focus my attention on some passages concerning aspects of Galdan's personality.

Kangxi himself, set out from Beijing on April 1, 1696, at the head of the Central Army. Thomas, along with Gerbillon and Pereira, joined the expedition as members of Kangxi's retinue. Many chapters of the *DBE* deal with the difficulties encountered by the army during the march across the Gobi desert (*Itineris incommode*, ch. 30; *Pabuli defectus*, ch. 33); the lack of food supplies that eventually forced the Emperor to turn back.

The Emperor, in order to stall Galdan for a while and gain time for the West Army to block his retreat, had sent envoys to Galdan. In the *DBE* Thomas records Galdan's answer as follows:

> *In the past years, as I reached the boundaries of the Empire with the army to ask for the surrender of my brother's murderer, a Lama sent by you came to me to negotiate peace; although I talked seriously about it, during the night your army treacherously attacked my military camp; then I put it to flight. Moreover, shortly after I was attacked by another of your armies; I withstood it and successfully drove it away from my military camp, even though the size of the armies were unequal. […] In the meantime, my brother's murderer lives by you and under your protection. […] This is the reason to take up arms to oppose and fight your army. Although larger than mine, you know that I will win because of the good cause and not because of the number of soldiers.*[63]

Both Thomas and Gerbillon (*Description*, p. 313) think that, even though the letter was written in a moderate tone, hiding his ambition, Galdan was steadily determined, even if his army was inferior to the Qing, to fight for the conquest of the Empire.[64] According to Thomas, two Zhüngar prisoners, after giving information about Galdan's army, stated that Galdan was "fixed and determined to go against and to enter into battle against the Emperor" (*DBE*, ch. 43). Nevertheless, when he was informed that the Emperor was coming in person with a large army, he fled far away as soon as possible; while doing so

[62] Cf. Ahmad, 1970, p. 298; Perdue, 2005, p. 180.

[63] *DBE*, ch. 37.

[64] Kangxi also considers this letter as written "in a generally friendly tone as before", quoted in Okada, 1979b, p. 3.

he ran directly into the West Army headed by General Fiyanggū.[65] In the battle of Jao-modo Galdan was defeated and his forces were destroyed. Although Thomas did not witness the decisive battle describes it in a lively and vivid way in the *DBE* four chapters. Gerbillon also gives a short account (*Description*, p. 329). Moreover, Gerbillon was able to obtain further information when the report about the battle sent by Fiyanggū was read by the Emperor from his tent, "Comme j'étois près de Sa Majesté, j'éntendis distinctement le contenu de ces lettres" (*Description*, p. 330).[66] It is worthwhile to mention that Thomas was well aware of the dangers they experienced but thanks to the "favour of God" Galdan followed his own wrong view until his demise (see *DBE*, ch. 60).

Although Galdan's army suffered an heavy defeat at Jao-modo, the Zhüngar Qan managed to escape with only a small number of men. After running away, Galdan gathered the few soldiers that survived in a small valley and made a speech that Thomas reports as follows:

> *At that very moment the king [Galdan] looking at the heart of the soldiers, overcome by despair, hiding his sadness, with a serene look said to them, 'We find ourselves in this awkward situation and suffer the dishonour of flight, not because of you, but because of me. By hastening the march towards the Tula, I ordered you, even if you were exhausted, to fight against the best commanders and troops of the Empire in a disadvantageous place. And even more, you almost won the battle, but because of the misfortune of the war you abandoned the position and left it to the winners. Nevertheless, you have to remember that once the Chinese often defeated the Mongols before they conquered the Chinese Empire. Therefore, today, make the decision to get over the defeat; it would be appropriate that you carry on with a resolute mind, since we still have many ways to make up for the loss of the soldiers as well as for the supplies.* [67]

Judging from Galdan's words it seems that he was still strongly determined to pursue his ambition; even the Mongol's glorious past history could be useful to encourage them.

Kangxi led two more expeditions reaching as far as the Ordos (Oct.1696-Jan.1697) and Ningxia (1697) region; Gerbillon joined both of them, while Thomas only the last one. In the meantime, Galdan's followers dwindled day

---

[65] In *DBE* (ch. 51) it was recorded that Galdan held a council of war; Thomas gathered this information after Galdan's defeat from his lieutenants who joined the Emperor's army.

[66] After their return to Beijing, Gerbillon had many chances to talk with General Fiyanggū about his expedition, *Description*, p. 334.

[67] *DBE*, ch. 61.

after day, and the Qan himself was facing starvation (see *DBE*, ch. 67, *Caldanus miserabilis status*). Dissension within Galdan's camp because of the Qan's refusal to surrender led the Generals to split from him.[68]

Eventually, Galdan died under mysterious circumstances on April 4, 1697 during the Emperor's fourth campaign. The Emperor did not hear about Galdan's death until the night of June 2 (so 59 days later). According to a first report, Galdan died of an illness, while the Emperor's first suspicion was that he was poisoned. However, some later information reported that Galdan had committed suicide by ingesting poison and this was the official version provided by the Chinese sources.[69] In his manuscript (ch. 85) Thomas writes, without indicating a date, that Galdan, affected by an illness and most of all by a deep sorrow for his son's death, died in great pain, seized by convulsions and retching, thus confirming the first version of the facts. It is worth noticing that Father Gerbillon (*Description*, p. 379) reports, on the basis of an account made by an eunuch on June 13, that Galdan had committed suicide, thus confirming the "official" version of the facts. On the contrary, Thomas's words seem to confirm the hypothesis that Galdan had been poisoned, most probably by one of his lieutenants, as some scholars have argued.[70]

Conclusion

Thomas and Gerbillon accompanied Kangxi during his campaigns outside the Great Wall against Galdan. Both of them wrote accounts of these expeditions that are very important to us being the Jesuits themselves eye-witnesses of the events recorded. They never met the Zhüngar Qan, but thanks to their intimacy with the Emperor and the Court entourage they were able to gather their information from eye-witnesses or persons well informed on the facts. From the two Jesuit's point of view Galdan was a serious threat to the achievements of Christianity in China: on one hand, his hunger for power and his ambition led him to challenge Kangxi. The Emperor had promulgated in 1692 the famous Edict of Tolerance and was seen by the Jesuits as a wise rule with a high sense of justice. In order to praise Kangxi's benevolence and love for peace the Jesuits contrasted him with the evil and warlike nature of Galdan. This contraposition is particularly stressed in the *DBE*. On the other hand, Galdan had received a Buddhist education in Lhasa and was a protector of the Buddhist faith receiving support from the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan

[68] Perdue, 2005, p. 202.

[69] As demonstrated by Okada H. (1979a) the date of Galdan's death was moved later in time by the Chinese compilers of the *Shuomo fanlue* and *Qing shilu*; see also Perdue, 2005, pp. 202-203.

[70] Perdue, 2005, p. 203. On the other hand Ahmad (1970, p. 322) follows Gerbillon version.

high lamas. In the end his ambition and his sacrilegious beliefs led him, thanks to the favour of God, to his ruin.

davorantonucci@yahoo.it

Bibliography

Primary sources:

De Halde, Jean-Baptiste, S.J., 1735
Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie Chinoise, 4 vol. (Paris : Lemercier).
Martini, Martino, 1654
De Bello Tartarico Historia (Anversa).
THOMAS, A., 1696-1697
De Bello Cam Hi Imperatoris Tartaro:Sinici contra Tartaros Erutanos. Feliciter confecto anno 1697, ARSI (Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu), jap. sin. 149, ff. 557-561.
Thomas, Antoine,
Correspondence, ARSI, jap. sin. 148, 149.

Secondary sources:

AlbAnese, Andreina, 1981
Materiali cinesi su Galdan (Roma: Università di Roma, Studi Orientali pubblicati a cura della Scuola Orientale, vol. VII).
Ahmad, Zahiruddin, 1970
Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente – ISMEO, 'Serie Orientale Roma', XL).
Antonucci, Davor, 2006
Antoine Thomas S.I.: De Bello Cam Hi Imperatoris Tartaro:Sinici contra Tartaros Erutanos. Feliciter confecto anno 1697 (Ph.D. dissertation, Università "La Sapienza", Roma).
Antonucc, D., 2007a
"La 'Tartaria' nelle fonti dei missionari gesuiti in Cina tra il XVI e XVII secolo", in: *Atti del XI Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Cinesi* (Roma 22-24 Febbraio 2007, forthcoming).
Antonucc, D., 2007b
"An Unpublished Manuscript by Antoine Thomas: "The *De Bello Cam Hi Imperatoris Tartaro:Sinici contra Tartaros Erutanos. Feliciter confecto anno 1697*", in: N. Golvers & S. Lievens, eds, *A*

Lifelong Dedication to the China Mission. Essays Presented in Honor of Father Jeroom Heyndrickx, CICM, on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday and the 25th Anniversary of the F. Verbiest Institute K.U. Leuven (Leuven: Ferdinand Verbiest Institute, 'Leuven Chinese Studies', XVII), pp. 15-28.

Atwood, Christopher, 2004

Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire (New York: Facts on File, Inc.).

Barfield, Thomas J., 1989

The Perilous Frontier. Nomadic Empires and China (Oxford: B. Blackwell,'Studies in Social Discontinuity').

JamiI, Catherine, 1994,

"The French Mission and Ferdinand Verbiest's Scientific Legacy", in: J. W. Witek, S.J., ed., Ferdinand *Verbiest (1623-1688) Jesuit Missionary, Scientist, Engineer and Diplomat* (Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 'Monumenta Serica Monograph Series', 30), pp. 531-543.

Jami, C., 2007

"A Discreet Mathematician: Antoine Thomas (1644/1709) and his Textbooks", in: N. Golvers & S. Lievens, eds., *A Lifelong Dedication to the China Mission. Essays Presented in Honor of Father Jeroom Heyndrickx, CICM, on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday and the 25th Anniversary of the F. Verbiest Institute K.U. Leuven*, (Leuven: F. Verbiest Inst.), pp. 447-468.

Lo Sardo, Eugenio, 2003

"Antoine Thomas and George David's Maps of Asia", in: W. F. Vande Walle & N. Golvers, eds, *The History of the Relations between the Low Countries and China in the Qing Era (1644-1911)* (Leuven: Ferdinand Verbiest Foundation, 'Leuven Chinese Studies', 14)), pp. 75-88.

Hummel, Arthur W., ed., 1943-1944

Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (2 vol., Washington D. C.: The Library of Congress).

Mancall, Mark, 1971

Russia and China: Their Diplomatic Relations to 1728 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 'Harvard East Asian Series', 61).

Okada, Hidehiro, 1979a

"Galdan's Death : When and How ?", *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko - MTB*, 37, pp. 91-97.

Okada, H., 1979b

"Outer Mongolia through the Eyes of Emperor K'ang-hsi", *Journal of Asian and African Studies,* 18, pp. 1-11.

Okada, H., 1987
"Origins of the Dörben Oyirad", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 7, pp. 181-211.

Pelliot, Paul, 1960
Notes critiques d'histoire kalmouke (Paris : Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 'Œuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot', 6).

Perdue, Peter C., 2004
"The Qing Empire in Eurasian Time and Space: Lessons from the Galdan Campaigns", in: L. A. Struve, ed., *The Qing Formation in World-Historical Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 'Harvard East Asian Monographs', 234), pp. 57-91.

Perdue, P. C., 2005
China March West. The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press).

Pfister, Louis, S.J., [1932-1934], 1976
Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine, 1552-1773 (Shanghai : Imprimerie de la Mission ; reprint: San Francisco : Chinese Materials Center).

Sebes, Joseph, S.J., 1961
The Jesuits and the Sino-Russian Treaty of Nerchinsk, 1698. The Diary of Thomas Pereira,S.J. (Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I.).

Thomaz de Bossierre, Yves de, 1977
Un Belge mandarin à la cour de Chine aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Antoine Thomas, 1644-1709, Ngan To P'ing-che (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).

Thomaz de Bossierre, Y. de, 1994
Jean-François Gerbillon, S.J. (1654-1707). Un des cinq mathématiciens envoyés en Chine par Louis XIV (Leuven : Ferdinand Verbiest Foundation).